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### NC

#### Any public is composited with a plurality of views. This creates a dilemma between accepting subjectivity or coercion. However, subjectivity is untenable. I can’t say, “the sky is blue, but I don’t believe it”, since I have already committed myself the truth of the statement by uttering the preceding statement. This leaves us with coercion, but this just begs the question of what “just” coercion is in the first place.
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In the last two decades, theorists of deliberative democracy have stressed the democratic potential for reasoned persuasion to the almost complete exclusion of the independently justifiable arguments for power as coercion in democratic life. Yet **democracies must have their coercive as well as their deliberative moments.** Against deliberative theorists who associate the coercion in democracy with "violence" and make that coercion at best tangential to the democratic process, this essay argues that coercion must play a large, valuable, and relatively legitimate role in almost any democracy that functions well. But against those who assume the full legitimacy of coercion in conditions of lasting disagreement, this essay argues that **any justification for coercion will necessarily be incomplete. In conditions of lasting disagreement there is no unquestionably fair procedure for producing a decision to coerce.** Moreover, much **coercion in existing democracies will be far from fair, and policies requiring coercion will often have features that are far from just.** Recognizing the need for coercion, and recognizing too that no coercion can be either incontestably fair or predictably just, democracies must find ways of fighting, while they use it, the very coercion that they need. **Democracies usually fight their own coercive power by girding that power about with the institutional safeguards of individual rights, free speech and association, and other features of the "rule of law," sometimes including constitutional requirements that every policy have at least a nominal "public purpose."** Along with these safeguards, **democracies need political parties, interest groups, and other traditional institutions that can serve as instruments of formal opposition.** Less obviously, this essay argues that **democracies** also **need to foster** and value informal **deliberative enclaves of resistance in which those who lose in each coercive move can rework their ideas and their strategies, gathering their forces and deciding in a more protected space in what way or whether to continue the battle.**

#### We solve this with deliberation—communicative action bridges the gap between public and private subjectivities, creating ethics.
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“In my view, Habermas’s picture of bourgeois **private and public sphere is like two concentric circles linked through “communication.” The inner circle represents** private **autonomy** and its subjective particularity. **The possibility of the outer circle**--the public sphere and its generality and abstractness--**is a derivative of the inter-subjective dialogues in this inner circle.** The “exteriority” of the public and the objective is dependent upon the existence and development of the “interiority” of the private and the subjective. On the other hand, due to its objectivity and abstractness, **the public sphere is able to secure a “social space of communication structure” for** concrete and subjective private **individuals, in which they can** “communicate with each other, and **confirm each other’s subjectivity** as it emerged from their spheres of intimacy” (Habermas 1989a, 54; 1996, 360). The bourgeois public sphere is a historical product of the dialectical play of the subjective interior and the objective exterior spaces. Nonetheless, **when this historical relationship between the interior and the exterior in the** bourgeois **public sphere reversed, the nature of public sphere also under went “social-structural transformation.”** Following Adorno’s analysis of the culture industry in the 1940’s, Habermas argues that the arrival of the culture industry contributed greatly to this transformation--in both the spheres of publicness and the concept of rationality implied in it.3”

#### Moreover, governments represents the conclusion that people reach through deliberation since that determines what is “just” coercion.
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When delegitimation walks hand in hand with legitimation, **sufficient legitimation must remain to let** reasonably just **coercion** do its good work of **help**ing **organize social arrangements and redress**ing the **greater injustices that** would **emerge without it. Each individual in each society must feel out this delicate balance for herself. The trick is to recognize the importance** , particularly to the most disadvantaged, **of having a large number** of relatively **democratic** and relatively unchallenged **decisions made** (and democratic coercion imposed) **on a daily, monthly, and yearly basis** as a matter of routine, **and** at the same time to **recognize the importance**, particularly to the most disadvantaged, **of maintaining,** in the institutions and culture of the society and in the minds of its citizens, some **ongoing recognition and critique of the ways in which those decisions (and that coercion) are unfair and unjust.**

#### Thus, the standard is promoting deliberation.

#### I contend that granting a right to housing forecloses public deliberation. Labeling housing as a right shuts down dialogue; it becomes a trump card that prevents us from discussing foundation of the issue.
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First, and most fundamentally, **intrinsic to the notion of human rights is the idea that they are self-evident**, inalienable **and non-negotiable: ‘absolute’ in other words. But are the rights** declared by the architects of international and European human rights instruments – **particularly social rights such as the right to housing – any less politically contested than other claims about how material resources should be distributed in society?** One could argue that **labelling such claims as** moral **‘rights’ is a mere rhetorical device intended to shut down debate by investing one’s own particular political priorities with a ‘protected’ status**; after all, as Dworkin (1977) put it, **‘rights are trumps’.** But if one dispenses with theological or other natural law justifications for human rights, then what is the foundation of their protected status? Many human rights supporters argue that they are not anchored in a pre-social natural order or in divine reason, but rather are socially constructed and inter-subjective, rooted in a broad normative consensus about the things that all human beings are morally entitled to in order to attain a basic standard of living and to participate in society (Dean, 2010). **But the idea that such a consensus exists at a global level is, at the very least, highly arguable** (Finch, 1979; Miller, 1999; Lukes, 2008).

### K stuff

#### Deliberation allows for institutions to critique themselves opening themselves up for change.
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To fight that coercion at the same time as using it, **democracies can multiply the available deliberative arenas to vary the kinds of power that permeate each one. Different arenas facilitate critiques of power from different directions.** C. B. Macpherson and other theorists who excoriate political parties fail to recognize that parties and organized oppositions provide critical arenas for the losers in any given political interaction to rework their understandings of the situation and later return to the fray ]urgen Habermas and other theorists who deprecate interest groups do not value the deliberative functions these groups can perform. 34 **Expanding opportunities for democratic participation**, both by traditional efforts like voter registration and by developing new forms in the untraditional venues of workplaces, neighborhood town meetings, and deliberative referenda,35 **helps citizens fight coercion only when that participation itself does not cloud their understanding.** For participation to help people understand their interests better, **participants often need issues on which they have direct experience. They also often need a variety of different arenas for deliberation. They may need**, for example, **to oscillate between protected enclaves, in which they can explore their ideas in an environment of mutual encouragement, and more hostile but also broader surroundings in which they can test those ideas against the reigning reality.**